

**SECRET**

*MR. CHAPMAN*

9 JUL  
1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: Members of the GS-14 Evaluation Board

SUBJECT : The Precepts for the July 1970 Evaluation Board for GS-14 Officers of the Clandestine Service

REFERENCE : CSN 1-903, 12 January 1970, "New Procedure for Evaluation of Officers of the CS Career Service"

1. The Establishment and Convening of the GS-14 Evaluation Board

This memorandum transmits the approved precepts for the evaluation of GS-14 officers, per reference, by the Evaluation Board established therefor, to be convened on 13 July 1970. The Board will review all CS Career Service staff officers in this grade according to specified functional categories. The purposes of the review will be to identify officers with both high and low performance records and to make recommendations regarding career development.

2. Eligibility

I have approved the following eligibility requirements for CS officers presently in grade GS-14:

All CS Career Service officers ("D careerists") of grade GS-14 who have two years in grade as of 15 July 1970 shall be eligible for promotion. All officers in grade GS-14 who were promoted or appointed subsequent to 15 July 1968 will not be reviewed by this Evaluation Board for promotion purposes.

25X1

**SECRET**

GROUP 1  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

**SECRET**

25X1

25X1

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] The Evaluation Board will  
review and comment on the recommendations of the [REDACTED]  
before they are forwarded to the CS Career Board.

25X1

4. The members of the Evaluation Board and Panels  
convened for the review of GS-14 officers will be relieved  
of their appointments upon completion of the duties as pre-  
scribed in the attached precepts.

25X1

[REDACTED]  
Thomas H. Karamessines  
Deputy Director for Plans

Attachment:  
Precepts for GS-14  
Evaluation Board

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

PRECEPTS FOR THE  
GS-14 EVALUATION BOARD

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. General Directives to the Board and Its Panels	1
A. Major Responsibilities of the Evaluation Board	1
B. Scope	1
C. Factors to be Considered by the Board	1
II. Directives to the Individual Panels	9
A. Function of Evaluation Panels	9
B. Instructions	9
C. Panel Composition	10
D. Criteria	11
III. Specific Directives to Evaluation Board	12
A. Function of the Board	12
B. Instructions	12
IV. Confidential Nature of Deliberations	13
Appendix - Qualifications to be promoted to GS-15	14

**SECRET**

## SECRET

### I. General Directives to the Board and Panels

#### A. Major Responsibilities

1. The first major objective of the Board is to identify those officers who, by demonstrated performance and evidence of potential for utilization at higher levels of responsibility, merit recommendation for promotion.
2. The second major objective is to identify those officers who, on the basis of performance and potential, rank in the lowest percentiles of their grade in comparison with fellow officers of the same grade.

#### B. Scope

The Evaluation Board and its panels will review all available records (Office of Personnel file, CSPA file, and "home base" file) of all eligible "D careerists" in grade GS-14, except for Staff Agents and those GS-14's home based in the Technical Services Division.

#### C. Factors to be Considered by the Board in Evaluating Officers:

##### 1. Primary Factors

##### a. Quality and level of performance

(1) One of the three primary considerations in competitively evaluating an officer is his performance, i.e., the quality and quantity of work done.

(2) In the interest of rendering maximum equity in judging performance, Board members should bear in mind the level of the job performed by employees they evaluate. Otherwise it might happen that an employee performing work of a

SECRET

**SECRET**

lower level than his current grade will perform exceptionally well and could be rated unduly high, whereas an employee performing work of a higher level than his current grade may be rated too low. The Board should, for example, recognize those instances where a GS-14 may be in a GS-14 slot and be performing at a GS-15 level. Fitness reports always become more meaningful when considered in relation to the characteristics and level of the job performed.

(3) In determining the ranking of officers to provide promotion for the best qualified, recognition should be given to those who have demonstrated good judgment, initiative, creativity, self-reliance, adaptability, discipline, and the acceptance of responsibility. In most cases initiative can be judged by results. In other cases it may be necessary to consider the reasoning and judgment exhibited by an officer even though the results were not as good as anticipated.

(4) On the other end of the spectrum, among the grounds for placing an officer in the lowest percentiles are marginal productivity, consistent weakness in carrying out assigned tasks, procrastination, and well-documented occurrences of situations in which personality problems have clearly prevented an officer from working cooperatively and harmoniously with his superiors, peers, or subordinates and as a result have limited the effective performance of his assigned tasks. A low ranking does not, however, necessarily represent a judgment of unsatisfactory performance in an absolute sense; it reflects the Board's determination that the officer does not measure up relatively to the majority of officers in his grade.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

b. Growth Potential

(1) The evaluation of potential involves the assessment of an officer's ability, personal qualities, drive, motivation, judgment, imagination, and particularly a demonstrated capability to perform effectively at a higher level and to assume broader and increased responsibilities. Seniority in grade (i.e., length of service) should, in general, be sufficient to provide an adequate basis for judging performance in a given job at the current grade level, as well as to estimate the potential to perform at higher levels. It is important for the Board members to keep in mind that no employee should be rated lower than his performance merits simply because of the recency of his last promotion. To do so might penalize unusual efforts and talents as well as enhance the chances for promotion of those whose principal claim is that of seniority. Whenever competitive evaluation establishes officers' ratings as essentially equal, Board members may then appropriately give added weight to considerations of age, length of qualifying experience, and general background.

(2) The Board must recognize the necessity to retain marked operational talents in the operational field. Advancement should not be limited to those whose talents are essentially managerial.

c. Personal Characteristics and Qualifications

(1) To merit recommendation for promotion, officers should demonstrate certain attributes and attitudes which are regarded as general CS requirements. Among these

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

are integrity, courage, initiative, decisiveness, willingness to accept responsibility, dependability, adaptability, and good judgment. Officers are also expected to demonstrate a maturely disciplined attitude toward the CS and their role in it, including mobility and the concomitant willingness to serve where and when needed. The Board should be specifically alert to any officer's unwillingness to place the needs of the U.S. Government before personal preferences or convenience, recognizing that in some cases there may be compelling reasons, such as service-connected disability.

(2) A common criticism of promotion panel systems is that they tend to reward employees who conform to prevailing opinion. Since this tendency would jeopardize the merit system and the effectiveness of the CS officer staff, every effort must be made to give due credit to employees who have shown themselves capable of sound, independent judgment, creative work, self-reliance, and the acceptance of unusual responsibility. If the initiative of an employee has led to some difficulty, he should not be severely judged because a calculated risk did not work out if the attempted line of action was worthwhile. Similarly, panel members should be wary of employees who restrict their output in order to concentrate on a few work products for the purpose of receiving special commendations.

## 2. Other Factors

### a. Conduct and Suitability

The standards of conduct and suitability for a CS officer are high. His reputation and that of his family must be

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

above reproach, whether they are serving in the United States or abroad, but most particularly abroad, where their conduct comes under close scrutiny.

b. Nature and Type of Service

All CS officers should be considered as officers of equal status without consideration as to how they achieved their designation in the officer category, their previous employment status, or whether service has been primarily overseas or in Headquarters. Similarly, each officer should be regarded on an equal basis whether or not his assignments have been highly specialized, general, or of a training nature, or whether he is currently on an assignment different from his regular functional specialty. The factor which should be given considerable weight is the willingness of the employee to meet his career staff obligations.

c. Training Assignments

The Board should seek to insure that an officer assigned as student or instructor to an extended training program is not placed at a disadvantage in the Board competition because his file does not contain a documented record of accomplishment comparable to that of his colleagues on regular assignments. Training is an important element in career development; selection for it presumes that an officer has distinct potential, and a record of successful completion should be viewed as a distinct credit to the officer.

d. Medical and Security Information

(1) The Board should not be influenced by any diagnosis or prognostication by rating or reviewing officers regarding

**SECRET**



**SECRET**

medical problems, physical or psychiatric, concerning either the employee or a member of his family. The Board may note for competent professional review the apparent existence of a problem and its possible effect on an officer's performance or potential.

(2) The above also applies to security information. As all CS officers are expected to have a highly developed sense of security, the Board should take into consideration any indication of weakness in this regard. However, an isolated case of personal misbehavior should be viewed in its overall context and should not unduly influence the Board in its evaluation of an individual officer.

(3) Prior to submission to the CS Career Board of the Board's recommended promotions, DDP/OP will notify the Director of Personnel of the proposed actions and obtain his advice together with that of the Inspector General, Director of Security, and the Director of Medical Services in order to determine the fitness of the individuals being considered, and inform DDP/OP of their advice.

e. Information Not in the Personnel Files

If a Board member has personal knowledge of information which is not in the record of an officer being rated and which the Board member believes is pertinent to an evaluation and should be considered, he should make that information available to other Board members in a signed memorandum. The original of this memorandum will be forwarded to the Chief, DDP/OP and will subsequently be included in the Official Personnel Folder or career service personnel file as appropriate. The Board members' personal knowledge of any individual

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

officer being ranked, while useful, should not be given undue weight. A Board member should disqualify himself from ranking any officers whom he may feel he cannot objectively evaluate due to close association or strong personal feelings.

**f. Quality of Reports**

The effectiveness of any evaluation system depends to a large extent on the accuracy and completeness of the fitness reports made upon the individual being evaluated. The Board should attempt to identify both those rating and reviewing officers who prepare high quality informative reports, and those whose reports reveal marked carelessness and inconsistency in preparation, personal bias, or prejudice, or non-compliance with authorized procedures. This should prove useful to other Evaluation Boards in making recommendations for promotion, assignment, or administrative action on rating and reviewing officers, and for the correction of fitness report deficiencies.

**3. Other Considerations**

a. In evaluating employees whose records reflect adverse reports or criticisms, the Board should determine whether the adverse material has been out-dated by more recent favorable performance. Giving undue weight to past reports of defects which an employee has corrected may create an unjust permanent handicap to his career. Board members must be as sensitive to records reflecting improved performance as they are to those which reflect deterioration.

b. Developing and retaining the required number of qualified personnel in all lines of work are problems which the CS must face.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

Major objectives of the Agency career program are to provide career staff members with a broader base of training and experience to increase their versatility and assignment potential and to aid in the development of employees in highly specialized fields. In competitively evaluating employees for promotion, the Board should consider the present value of the employee to the CS, as well as his potential usefulness. Of pertinence to the value of an employee to the CS is his possession of scarce occupational skills and experience which are difficult to replace and which may require arduous training or unpleasant assignments for their acquisition.

c. Summary

The Board should appraise: (1) the quality of the officer's performance; (2) his growth potential; and (3) his personal characteristics and qualifications.

An officer must be judged on the basis of established strengths and weaknesses in each of these categories, but undue emphasis should not be placed on one to the exclusion of the others. All three must be considered together in arriving at an over-all evaluation.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

## Precepts for the GS-14 Evaluation Board, July 1970

## II. Directives to the Individual Panels

A. Function of Evaluation Panels

One product of panel action will be a list of employees ranked in order of relative merit as advice to the Board in making its promotion recommendations to the CS Career Service Board. The panels will also provide the Board lists of employees in the low 10% category, and will make written comments and suggestions on career development deemed desirable for any employee who has been reviewed. Panels will be comprised of a minimum of three members of the Career Service concerned, senior by two grades to employees being evaluated, and appointed by the Head of the Career Service to serve for the period required to evaluate all eligible employees in the grade groups and competitive promotion areas assigned.

B. Instructions

1. Prepare a rank-order list, utilizing the numerical composite score method approved by the DDP, of the upper 15% of eligible officers in grade GS-14 in each functional category. Although the Divisions and Staffs may indicate a rank-order, utilizing their own system, for those officers whom they recommend for promotion, these rankings are to be considered as advisory only and the panels will not be bound by these rankings in their own deliberations and rank-order gradings. The panels will consider component submissions before completing their own recommendations.

2. Prepare a rank-order list, utilizing the numerical composite score method approved by the DDP, of the low 10% of the total number of eligible officers in grade GS-14 in each functional category.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

3. Prepare a list of those officers who should be commended or criticized for the quality of fitness reports prepared on subordinates. In cases of criticism for poorly prepared reports, the panel will separately cite the specific deficiencies.

4. Make specific recommendations concerning training or assignment for any officer. In addition to determining that an officer's qualifications can be utilized to advantage at the next higher grade level, the panels should make an estimate as to where and how he might be expected to serve in the future. For example, can an officer be expected to serve as a branch chief, chief of base, chief of station, senior case officer, senior analyst, etc.?

5. Prepare recommendations concerning the policies and procedures to be followed by subsequent panels, including comments concerning the adequacy of the present system of evaluating officers.

6. Suggest, where appropriate, that certain officers be recommended to receive Quality Step Increases.

#### C. Panel Composition

The Evaluation Board will consist of three panels designated to review the performance of all officers in grade GS-14 according to their functional category and under the eligibility requirements as stated in paragraphs two and three of the DD/P memorandum transmitting the precepts.

Panel A will be composed of three members, with one member designated by the DD/P serving as chairman. It will review and evaluate all GS-14 officers in the analytical/reports category, namely, reports officers, intelligence analysts, intelligence research officers, and CI analysts.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

Panel B will be composed of six members, with one member designated by the DD/P serving as chairman. This panel will divide equally among two sub-panels all files of eligible GS-14 officers in the operational category. The sub-panels will coordinate regularly to insure similar application of criteria. After an initial determination of the top 20% and the low 10%, the two sub-panels will convene as a single panel to rank further those officers found to be in the highest and lowest percentiles.

Panel C will be composed of three members, with one member designated by the DD/P serving as chairman. It will review and evaluate all eligible officers in the operational support category; namely those (except ops officers on rotational assignments) in positions concerned with records management, systems analysis and programming, [redacted] organizational and management, training, non-operational agent handling [redacted]

[redacted]

In addition, there will be a senior officer designated as Evaluation Board chairman. Each panel chairman will be responsible for coordinating the activities of his panel.

#### D. Criteria

In addition to the general qualifications considered in the preceding directives, each individual panel should evaluate employees against the specific qualifications of GS-14 officers as outlined in the Appendix.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

### III. Specific Directives to Evaluation Board

#### A. Function of the Board

After the panels have completed their deliberations, the Board Chairman and the chairmen of the three functional panels will meet as a Board to review the work of the panels and to evaluate those officers placed by the panels in the highest 15% and lowest 10% in the respective functional categories. The Board will not be bound by component recommendations or rankings in its deliberations and rank-order gradings.

#### B. Instructions

1. Prepare a composite numerical rank-order list of recommended promotions within limits of headroom.
2. Prepare a composite numerical rank-order list of the low 5% of the total number of eligible officers. A written statement of reasons shall be prepared in the case of each officer so ranked.
3. Prepare recommendations concerning policies and procedures to be followed by subsequent Boards, including comments concerning the adequacy of this system of evaluating officers.
4. Make specific recommendations or suggestions with respect to training or assignment regarding any officer or groups of officers when, in the Board's judgment, such recommendations will improve his or their future use to the Clandestine Service.
5. Review and comment on the recommendations of the TSD Panel before they are forwarded to the CS Career Board.
6. Forward all the above to the CS Career Board via DDP/OP.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

#### **IV. Confidential Nature of Deliberations**

A. Selection as a member of the Evaluation Board and its subordinate panels is one of confidence and trust. Members are expected to perform, without prejudice or partiality, faithfully, and to the best of their ability, the duties imposed upon them as members of the Evaluation Board.

B. Because of the sensitive nature of this assignment, members must preserve the confidential character of all personnel records used by the Board and must not reveal to any person, not specifically authorized by the DDP, information concerning the deliberations, findings, rankings, and recommendations of the Board.

**SECRET**



**SECRET**

## Appendix

### Qualifications to Be Promoted to GS-15

#### A. General

A GS-15 is expected to have demonstrated over many years the practical experience, ability, and personal character which qualify him to serve in executive and policy positions in Headquarters and abroad. He is expected to have a high sense of public service, complete integrity, mature and disciplined judgment, good presence and personality, a first-rate mind, and a driving desire for accomplishment. Typically, he will have demonstrated leadership and command talent, insight into the intelligence process, policy sense, executive proficiency, competence in planning and conducting intelligence operations, or in providing staff support for such operations, and well-developed skills in oral and written expression.

He will be expected to have a wide knowledge of the key CS programs in the intelligence field. His perspective will include the interests and functional considerations that are pertinent to decisions relating to the role of intelligence in the foreign affairs process. His stature will have developed to the point where his outlook is not colored or influenced by bureaucratic or parochial considerations.

Typically, the qualifications described above will have been developed in one or more of the major functional areas of

Service, a GS-15 would normally have been assigned responsibilities of an executive and policy nature requiring synthesis of several functional areas. During this career development he would probably have served several tours of duty overseas, at least one of which included an assignment as a Chief of Operations or a Deputy Chief of Station of a large Station or Chief of

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

a smaller Station. If command responsibility has been primarily at Headquarters, he will have served as Executive Officer or Deputy Chief, or Chief of a large component in an operating division or senior staff.

His earlier career will have been marked by initiative and creativity. He will have exhibited intellectual curiosity beyond the bounds of official business and will have developed comprehension of the political, economic, and sociological forces at work in countries and areas to which he has been assigned. He should have acquired and used in operations and liaison one or two languages at at least the intermediate level. There will have been consistent evidence in his performance of purposeful and effective effort to advance our national intelligence objectives. Although, as will be noted below, executive ability is not in all cases a sine qua non for promotion to GS-15, it is an important consideration in most cases. The Board should determine if the officer demonstrates the ability or potential to plan, organize, direct, motivate, and coordinate the work of an operating component or staff engaged in at least one of the major functional responsibilities of the Clandestine Service.

In some instances there will emerge a small number of officers whose careers have been almost exclusively in one particular specialty [redacted]

[redacted] In reviewing the records of such officers, the Board should bear in mind that there is a need for the GS-15 case officer, for officers in GS-15 positions in staff and specialist positions, and to perform specialized management functions. In such cases evaluation of an officer's promotability must be based primarily on a demonstrated superior performance and potential in his specialty, rather than in competition with a significant number of other officers who have had broader experience involving substantial command responsibilities in the operational field.

#### B. Analytical/Reports Category

1. An officer whose own skills, knowledge, and understanding of his particular field is of a high order

**SECRET**25X1  
25X1  
25X1

**SECRET**

should be reviewed very carefully. In such cases a recommendation for promotion should be made where an officer's degree of attainment is so exceptional that he is deemed to merit advancement solely on the basis of his expertise and his use as a specialist in non-supervisory jobs, but has supervisory capabilities as well.

2. As an example of relative responsibility, consider the following as duties of a GS-14 Reports/Requirements Officer, and to some extent an FI or CI analyst:

- Maintain complete knowledge of current intelligence requirements of USIB regarding a major area of the world, such as China.

- Make decisions to accept or reject positive intelligence requirements received from CIA and external customers.

- Review on a continuing basis the product of each FI project of a major area to determine its degree of success in achieving its positive intelligence objectives.

- Maintain current knowledge of the reliability of all positive intelligence sources of his area of responsibility, and the value of their individual products.

3. In addition to performing completely in the foregoing as a GS-14, an officer in this category should be able, as a GS-15, to assume the following duties:

- Serve as Chief Reports Officer for an Area Division or major Station.

- Represent the Agency in inter-departmental discussions at the geographical area level.

**SECRET**

**Page Denied**

**SECRET**

#### D. Operational Support Category

1. The nature of the work of the CS requires some officers to perform highly specialized tasks which are difficult to categorize under traditional functions of case officer, reports officer, or analyst. These might be officers who have unique scientific, technical, managerial, or linguistic skills. Such officers should be given full recognition for demonstrated ability in such positions and must not be placed at a disadvantage in relation to their colleagues. Sustained superior performance in specialized endeavors which enable the officers to demonstrate potential for further growth, even within the specialty, shall be recognized in making recommendations for promotion.

2. Presumably the real operational support professional is able to judge new material and its bearing. The difference between a GS-14 and a GS-15 lies in substantially increased independence and responsibility. In some positions this might be shown by responsibility for directing and supervising others. Where this is not so, there must be something else of an equivalent nature in background and application--e.g., foreign languages, ADP training, technical ability, commercial experience--which is not only acquired but used extensively in the position filled.

**SECRET**

### PILOT PROGRAM

Before the actual review of performance files, all Panel members should make a thorough study of the Precepts, other instructional materials and the steps in the Rank-order Process. When this has been done, the Panel Chairman should initiate a pilot program as described below.

Such a pilot program can save time by ensuring that all Panel members understand the procedures and criteria found in the Precepts. It is particularly important that Panel members have a proper understanding of the value or weight which should be given to various factors in evaluating an officer's performance and in placing his name on the rank-order list.

The Chairman should select at random ten files. Each member should then review each of the ten files which have been chosen and assign a score, ranging from one to ten, to each of the sample files. No two files should have the same score.

When all members have evaluated and scored each file, the Chairman shall call the roll and tabulate all the scores. In the process each Panel member should comment, as necessary, upon the scores he has given. If there is a wide variance in the scores assigned to a particular file, the Panel Chairman should encourage discussion to determine the reason for the discrepancy. A wide variance in scoring usually indicates a misinterpretation of values and this may be resolved through discussion and by closer adherence to the Precepts.

The pilot program can be done in one day and should take no longer than two days. The Board Chairman should ensure that through this exercise and discussions Board members have properly understood the Precepts and the grading procedures. During the execution of the pilot program the Board Chairman should keep a member of the PMS fully informed of the proceedings and should seek his assistance whenever required.

SECRET

S-E-C-R-E-T

### Summary of Steps in Ranking Process

1. Study the general precepts and specific qualifications criteria for the grade level under consideration.
2. Each panel member reviews the ten files of officers in the grade and category assigned to the panel for a given day.
3. Each panel member assigns a preliminary numerical rating from 10 (the highest) to 1 (the lowest) to each officer in the grade and function being considered.
4. At the end of each day the ratings for each officer are entered on a matrix. If there are no significant variations (i.e., if there is no spread of more than 3 points for any officer) then the scores are totaled for each officer, and the names are arranged in rank-order. The top 3 or 4 officers are tentatively marked "High," and the bottom 2 or 3 are tentatively marked "Low". Scores of 25 and over may be considered high, and scores of 5 or under as low, but this is a flexible rule.
5. Significant variations in the numerical ratings should be resolved, after careful discussion by the panel members, by appropriate adjustment of rankings by individual panel members.
6. Ties should be broken by a further round of voting. A composite score for any one rated officer may run from a maximum of 30 to a minimum of 3.
7. Steps 2 through 6 are repeated each day with a new set of ten files.
8. At the end of 5 days (or after reviewing the files of 50 officers) the cumulative highs and lows are rank-ordered by the panel. This will normally comprise about 15 high-ranked officers and 10 low-ranked officers.

S-E-C-R-E-T

S-E-C-R-E-T

9. Step 8 is repeated at the end of each 50 files.
10. When all files have been reviewed, each panel member will establish a roster of all high officers on a scale of 1 to 10, placing an equal number of officers in each percentile. The scores for each officer are then adjusted according to the point spread of three rule, and added up. Ties are broken by further voting, and the resulting list furnishes the rank-order listings for whatever percentiles are required.
11. The same procedure is then used to rank-order the bottom 10%.
12. In category B deliberations, because of the large number of files to be reviewed, the panel is divided into two sub-panels, and each sub-panel reviews and rank-orders one-half of the files according to the procedure in steps 2 through 8 above. Then each sub-panel reviews and rank-orders those officers who have been high-ranked and low-ranked by the other sub-panel, plus the files of any officers top-ranked by a component but not included in the high's by the sub-panels. Then the sub-panels sitting jointly rank-order all highs and all lows as described in para 10.

S-E-C-R-E-T



S-E-C-R-E-T

Example of Rank-Order Process

There are 30 individuals in a functional category of a given GS grade which requires ranking for determination of the highest or the lowest group.

1. Each member of a three-man panel will review his work sheets and any file not previously reviewed by him and grade each of the 30 officers according to the following procedure. To ensure that the grades assigned by one member are equal in weight to those assigned by other members, the chairman will designate that as nearly as possible 10% of the total number of officers rated is placed in each of ten rating levels.

a. In the case of 30 individuals, the number of officers assigned to each level would be 3.

b. If the total number is divisible by ten as in the foregoing example, exactly one-tenth is placed at each rating level. If not, the number of officers allocated to each level should not differ by more than one from the number allocated to any of the other levels. See the following:

Illustration I

Rating Level

Number of officers which each member assigns to each level if the total number of officers is:

	30	43	65
10	3	5	7
9	3	5	7
8	3	5	7
7	3	4	7
6	3	4	7
5	3	4	6

Rating Level	Number of officers which each member assigns to each level if the total number of officers is:		
	30	43	65
4	3	4	6
3	3	4	6
2	3	4	6
1	3	4	6

2. After reviewing each performance record, each member, without reference to the grade assignments of other members, will give the officer being rated a numerical grade from 10 (the highest) to 1 (the lowest) in an appropriate space on his work sheet. He will also record on the work sheet essential facts to help recall the officer's record when grades are discussed and other facts which may be needed to complete special reports called for in the precepts and in recommendations for administrative action. These grades are relative and are the basis for the final rating.

3. After members have completed the assignment of grades and adjusted them to conform to the prescribed distribution pattern (i.e., 10% in each level), the chairman calls for a preliminary tally. The chairman should read through the tally list and record after the name of each officer the grade assigned by each member. If there is a significant variation (more than 3 points) among the grades assigned to a particular officer, that officer is then discussed under the leadership of the chairman. Each Board member is given the opportunity to indicate the factors which influenced him in the assignment of a particular grade. Members may then make whatever changes they wish in grades as long as any upward or downward revision is balanced by a compensating revision in the rating level assigned to another officer in order to preserve the prescribed distribution pattern. Each member informs the chairman of any changes in grading. This process continues until a final vote is taken.

4. After taking the final tally, the grades assigned to each officer are totaled to provide a composite score (in the case of a 3-man panel, this could range from 30 to 3).

S-E-C-R-E-T

a. The final tally sheet arranged alphabetically and composite score will appear as below:

Illustration II

	Chairman	Member A	Member B	Composite Total
1.	2	2	1	5
2.	10	10	9	29
3.	4	4	3	11
4.	4	5	5	14
5.	8	7	9	24
6.	3	3	2	8
7.	5	5	5	15
8.	9	10	9	28
9.	4	4	4	12
10.	1	2	1	4
11-24 { 20.	9	10	10	29
25.	6	6	6	18
26.	2	4	3	9
27.	10	10	9	29
28.	9	9	9	27
29.	4	4	4	12
30.	2	1	1	4

b. From the tally sheet of composite scores the panel will prepare a list of all composite scores beginning with the highest and ending with the lowest.

5

S-E-C-R-E-T

S-E-C-R-E-T

Group together officers having the same composite score listing them in alphabetical order. See Illustration III below, taken from alphabetical tally sheet, Illustration II:

Illustration III

29	
28	
27	
24	
18	
15	
-----	
Other composite scores between 8 - 15	
-----	
8	
5	
4	
4	

5. Rank-Order within Composite Score Groups. Officers within the same composite score group must be ranked again to determine their positions within their score group. Assuming that there are 3 officers in composite score group 29, each member of the panel assigns a grade of 3 to the officer he believes to be the best, a grade of 2 to the second best, and a grade of 1 to the remaining one. A tabulation will then be made showing the sum of the grades assigned to each officer by each panel member. If there is a tie, the scores given to the tied officer by the chairman will break the tie and determine the relative placements of these officers.

S-E-C-R-E-T

Illustration IV

Chairman	Member A	Member B	Totals
1	2	3	6
3	3	2	8
2	1	1	4

Listing will therefore be as follows:

within the composite score group of 29.

6. If the panel is considering the tentative high group, rank-order is determined from the top down to the point where the desired percentage is reached. The lowest group is determined by working from the bottom up.